

TEMPLATE FOR NEW AND CHANGED PEER REVIEW PLANS

December, 2012

General Item Information:

(Web) ID number (for pre-existing item that you are updating): _____ .

1. (Web) HISA _____ or ISI XX (Check one.)
2. Your Line Office: _____ NMFS
3. (Web) Title (max 255 characters): SEDAR 28 Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic Cobia and Spanish Mackerel
4. Keywords (max 255 characters. Keywords are words that aid retrieval in database searches). SEDAR, HMS, Spanish mackerel, cobia, assessment
5. (Web) Description of information (subject and purpose): This information product is a determination of the condition and status of the fishery resource stocks (Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic cobia and Spanish Mackerel) relative to definitions for overfishing and overfished status. The information includes impacts of various management scenarios on the status of the stocks, estimates of management benchmarks, and recovery trajectories for those stocks determined to be overfished. The information is provided to the appropriate regional fishery management agencies to be used as the basis of their management decisions, which are subsequently approved and disseminated by the Secretary of Commerce through NOAA Fisheries.
6. Lead Contact Person and Back-up Contact Person:
NOTE: The names of the "Contact Person" and "Back-up Contact Person" requested below are for internal use only. The "Contact Person" name posted to the Web will always be the name of the 515 Working Group Representative for your Line or Staff Office.
 - a. Lead Contact Person Division or Branch: SEDAR/NMFS
 - b. Lead Contact Person Name: Ryan Rindone
 - c. Lead Contact Person Title: SEDAR Coordinator
 - d. Lead Contact Person Phone #: 813-348-1630
 - e. Back-up Contact Person Name: Larry Massey
 - f. Back-up Contact Person Title: Operations Research Analyst

g. Back-up Contact Person Phone #: (386) 561-7080

7. Project start date (Give actual date, not time period.): 12 / 01 / 2011 /
8. Estimated start date of the peer review: (*Web*) 10 / 29 / 2012 / (South Atlantic stocks)
01/09/2013 (Gulf of Mexico stocks)
9. Estimated dissemination date of the FINAL PEER REVIEW REPORT* (Give actual date, not time period.): (*Web*) 12 / 05 / 2012 (South Atlantic stocks)
03/15/2013 (Gulf of Mexico stocks)

**The final peer review report is a summary of peer review comments, with comments organized by sections of the draft work product, NOT by reviewer responses (‘s comments, followed by ‘s comments).*

Peer Review Information:

1. (*Web*) Review Type:
 - a. X A panel. (South Atlantic stocks)
 - b. X Individual letters. (Gulf of Mexico stocks)
 - c. Rely on NAS report.
 - d. NAS review.
 - e. adequate prior peer review (Consult with your 515 rep before checking this.)
 - f. Alternative procedure approved by OMB.
2. (*Web*) Number of Reviewers: Anticipated number of reviewers:
 - a. X 3 or fewer; (Gulf of Mexico stocks)
 - b. X 4-10, or (South Atlantic stocks)
 - c. More than 10.
3. (*Web*) Reviewers will be selected by:
 - a. The agency.
 - b. X A designated outside organization
4. (*Web*) N (Y/N) Will the public, including scientific or professional societies, be asked to nominate potential peer reviewers?
5. (*Web*) Y (Y/N) Will there be opportunities for the public to comment on the work product to be peer reviewed?
6. (*Web*) How? (Describe): Oral and written comments

7. (Web) When? (Describe)(max 255 characters): Oral and written comments will be accepted during designated Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic Council comment periods and during Council SSC review, per Council guidelines.
8. (Web) Y (Y/N) Will the agency provide significant and relevant public comments to the peer reviewers before they conduct their review?
9. (Web) Give succinct description of the primary disciplines or expertise needed in the review (Give name/title of each discipline and short description.): fisheries stock assessment, fisheries biology, population dynamics

Document links:

In addition to the above items, the peer review agenda must contain links to all documents made public pursuant to the Peer Review Bulletin. Therefore, provide linking URLs for the following documents. **Do not include any documents within this template.** Either provide links in the template, or list file names in the template and provide the files separately. ***All links must point to specific documents, rather than to a general site.*** OMB has specifically asked us to do this.

1. Any charge statement to the peer reviewers (always required).
SEDAR, SouthEast Data, Assessment and Review is a Regional Fishery Management Council process, not a National Marine Fisheries Service process. The Gulf of Mexico, South Atlantic and Caribbean Fishery Management Councils approved the Terms of Reference:

South Atlantic Cobia:

<http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/download/2012%20SA%20Cobia%20Benchmark%20TOR%20SAFMCAPPROVED.pdf?id=DOCUMENT>

South Atlantic Spanish mackerel:

<http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/download/2012%20SA%20Spanish%20Bench%20TOR%20SAFMC%20APPROVED.pdf?id=DOCUMENT>

Gulf of Mexico Cobia:

<http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/download/2012%20GoM%20Cobia%20Benchmark%20TOR%20Final.pdf?id=DOCUMENT>

Gulf of Mexico Spanish mackerel:

<http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/download/2012%20GoM%20Spanish%20Mackerel%20Benchmark%20TOR%20Final.pdf?id=DOCUMENT>

2. The final peer review report* (always required) of comments received.

South Atlantic Cobia:

http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/download/S28_SAR_SACobia_Final_1.9.2013.pdf?id=DOCUMENT

South Atlantic Spanish mackerel:

http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/download/S28_SAR_SASpMack_Final_1.3.2013.pdf?id=DOCUMENT

The Gulf of Mexico cobia and Spanish mackerel Final Stock Assessment Reports will be available at the following once complete:

http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/Sedar_Workshops.jsp?WorkshopNum=28

3. Any agency response to the peer review report (required for all HISAs, recommended for all ISI). For HISAs, agency response must explain:
 - a. the agency's agreement or disagreement with the views expressed in the report
 - b. the actions the agency has undertaken or will undertake in response to the report
 - c. the reasons the agency believes those actions satisfy the key concerns stated in the report (if applicable)
4. HISA draft assessment (must be posted whenever made public, and should be made public "whenever feasible and appropriate").
5. ISI work product** (only *required* to be posted if and when agency makes the work product available in the peer review context).

South Atlantic Cobia:

http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/download/S28_SAR_SACobia_Final_1.9.2013.pdf?id=DOCUMENT

South Atlantic Spanish mackerel:

http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/download/S28_SAR_SASpMack_Final_1.3.2013.pdf?id=DOCUMENT

The Gulf of Mexico cobia and Spanish mackerel Final Stock Assessment Reports will be available at the following once complete:

http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/Sedar_Workshops.jsp?WorkshopNum=28

**The final peer review report is a summary of peer review comments, with comments organized by sections of the draft work product, not by reviewer responses (‘s comments, followed by ‘s comments). Here is a link to an example -*

http://sanctuaries.noaa.gov/science/condition/pdfs/fbnms_site_scenario.pdf

*Note: this is actually the **agency response to the peer review report**, but it contains the peer review report. Either is acceptable – the draft work product with comments and edits, or the final agency response.*

***The final work product is the final publication, which has been peer reviewed and received final edits.*

Annual Reporting Requirements (for completed peer reviews):

1. 11 / 02 / 2012 (South Atlantic Stocks) Date on which peer review report* was completed. For letter reviews, the peer review report is considered complete when all reviews have been received.
2. 12 / 21 / 2012 (South Atlantic Spanish mackerel) 01/09/2013 (South Atlantic Cobia) Dissemination date of peer reviewed information product. (Actual dissemination date as opposed to the estimated dissemination date provided in the initial peer review plan.)
3. Y (Y/N) Was the peer review panel conducted in public?
4. Y (Y/N) Was the public provided an opportunity to comment on the information product?
5. (Y/N) Did the agency receive written comments on the adequacy of the peer review plan?
6. N (Y/N) Were any of the peer reviewers recommended by a professional society or the public?
7. (Y/N) Was the peer reviewed information used by NOAA to support a regulatory action?
If yes, did the agency include a certification of compliance with Peer Review Bulletin and IQA requirements and relevant materials (e.g., the peer review report) in the administrative record for the regulatory action?